

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,361	01/04/2006	Ken-ichi Watanabe	0020-5458PUS1 8791	
	7590 11/13/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747			RAHMANI, NILOOFAR	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/563,361	WATANABE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Niloofar Rahmani	1625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status	•						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Se	entember 2007						
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10,12,15 and 16</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11,13,14 and 17</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
<u> </u>	<u> </u>						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ⊠ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
I) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Other:							
. spot trotopriman bate	5/ L. Ottlet						

Application/Control Number: 10/563,361

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are pending in the instant application.

Applicant's election without traverse of group III, claims 9(full), 1-8,11,13-14,17(in part), drawn to a heteroaryl derivative of formula (I), wherein Z being **pyrrole** in the reply filed on 09/10/2007 is acknowledged.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 9 (full), 1-8,11,13-14,17(in part), drawn to a heteroaryl derivative of formula (I), wherein Z being **pyrrole** are examined. Claims 10,12,15-16 and the remaining subject matter of claims 1-8, 11,13-14 are withdrawn per 37 CFR 1.142(b).

2. Priority

This application was filed on 01/04/2006, which is a 371 of PCT/JP04/10282, filed on 07/13/2004, which claims PRIORITY of JAPAN 2003-274684, filed on 07/15/2003.

3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrugs of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry to use the invention. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and the breadth of the claims", In re Rainer, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, that produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be clinically effective. Determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

b) The direction concerning the prodrugs is found on page 21, lines 3-11 of the instant application. c) There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (1). d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of

compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. e) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) summarizes the state of the prodrug art. Wolff, Manfred E. "Burger's Medicinal Chemistry, 5ed, Part I", John Wiley & Sons, 1995, pages 975-977. The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modern Pharmaceutics) Banker, G.S. et al, "Modern Pharmaceutics, 3ed.", Marcel Dekker, New York, 1996, pages 451 and 596. in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. f) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of

thousands of compounds of formula of claim 1 as well as the presently unknown list of potential prodrug derivatives embraced by claim 1.

4. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification lacks enablement of the terms "Z, Ar¹, Ar², W³, W⁴, R¹", which are claimed in the compound claims. While enabling for Z being 1,2 substituted pyrrole are not enabling for other types of pyrrole substituents. While enabling for Ar¹ being phenyl, pyridine, and thiophene are not enabling for other types of arylene or heteroarylene. While enabling for Ar² being phenyl are not enabling for other types of aryl or heteroaryl. While enabling for W³ being lower alkenylene are not enabling for single bond, a lower alkylene, or -Y-W⁵-. While enabling for W⁴ being a single bond are not enabling for -NR¹⁰-, NR¹⁰-W⁶-, a lower alkylene, or a lower alkenylene. Therefore, the specification lacks enablement for the terms "Ar¹, Ar², W³, W⁴, R¹" of the instant specification.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is

571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NILOOFAR RAHMANI

11/01 /2007

9n

Ø.MARGARĚT SEAMAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1625